1	Roberta Steele, Regional Attorney		
2	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission San Francisco District Office		
	450 Golden Gate Ave, 5th Floor West		
3	P.O. Box 36025		
4	San Francisco, CA 94102		
5	John F. Stanley, Supervisory Trial Atto	rnev	
6	John F. Stanley, Supervisory Trial Attorney Teri L. Healy, Senior Trial Attorney		
_	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission		
7	Seattle Field Office		
8	909 First Avenue, Suite 400		
9	Seattle, WA 98104		
10	Tel: (206) 220-6916		
	Facsimile: (206) 220-6911 teri.healy@eeoc.gov		
11	termenty c ecocigo v		
12	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF		
13			
14	IN THE UNITED ST	ATES DISTRICT COLIRT	
	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
15			
16		CIVIL ACTION NO.	
17	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT		
18	OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,	COMPLAINT	
19	Plaintiff		
20	v.	JURY TRIAL DEMAND	
21			
21	KAISER ALUMINUM		
22	WASHINGTON, LLC,		
23	Defendant.		
24		_	
	I		

EEOC v. KAISER ALUMINUM - COMPLAINT Page 1 of 10

25

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et. seq.*, ("ADA" and "ADAAA") to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of disability and to provide appropriate relief to Donald McMurray, who was adversely affected by such practices. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission alleges that Kaiser Aluminum Washington, LLC, ("Defendant" or "Kaiser") discriminated against Mr. McMurray, when it failed to hire Mr. McMurray for a production worker position at the Trentwood, Washington facility of Kaiser.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337, 1343 and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 107(a) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which incorporates by reference Sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3) ("Title VII"), and pursuant to Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a.

EEOC v. KAISER ALUMINUM - COMPLAINT Page 2 of 10

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "Commission" or "EEOC"), is the agency of the United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation and enforcement of Title I of the ADA and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Section 107(a) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which incorporates by reference Sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(f)(1).
- At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously been doing business 4. in the State of Washington and has continuously had at least 15 employees.
- At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously been an employer 5. engaged in an industry affecting commerce under Section 101(5) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(5), and Section 101(7) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(7), which incorporates by reference Sections 701(g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e(g) and (h).

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

2021

22

23

2425

6. At all relevant times, Defendant has been a covered entity under Section 101(2) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(2).

<u>ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES</u>

- 7. More than thirty (30) days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Charging Party Donald McMurray filed a charge with the EEOC alleging violations of Title I of the ADA by Defendant.
- 8. On August 24, 2016, the Commission issued to Defendant a Letter of Determination finding reasonable cause to believe that Title I of the ADA was violated and inviting Defendant to join with the Commission in informal methods of conciliation to endeavor to eliminate the discriminatory practices and provide appropriate relief.
- 9. The Commission engaged in communications with Defendant to provide Defendant the opportunity to remedy the discriminatory practices described in the Letter of Determination.
- 10. The Commission was unable to secure from Defendant a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.

///

///

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

11. On September 26, 2016, the Commission issued to Defendant a Notice of Failure of Conciliation.

- 12. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.
- 13. Since at least September 4, 2014, Defendant has engaged in unlawful employment practices in violation of Section 102(a) of Title I of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12112(a). Defendant discriminated against Mr. McMurray when it failed to hire him for a Production Worker Position at Kaiser's Trentwood facility in Eastern Washington in violation of Section 102(a) of the ADA.
- 14. Mr. McMurray is qualified for the Production Worker position because he has significant mechanical and construction experience. At the time of his application to Defendant on July 16, 2014, Mr. McMurray was working as a heavy machine operator. For this job, he regularly climbed in and out of large machinery and walked on uneven surfaces without accommodation.
- 15. Mr. McMurray is an individual with a disability under the law. Mr. McMurray has a record of disability from a workplace injury that took place in 2004. This record shows that McMurray's heel/foot injury substantially limited the major life activities of working, walking, and standing at that time.

EEOC v. KAISER ALUMINUM - COMPLAINT Page 5 of 10

Mr. McMurray applied for a Production Worker Position at Kaiser on

On August 27, 2014, Kaiser offered Mr. McMurray the position

On August 29, 2014, Mr. McMurray underwent a pre-employment

physical with Defendant's contractor Occupational Health Solutions, Inc. ("OHS").

Mr. McMurray successfully passed a breathalyzer test, a drug test, a vision test, a

hearing test and a reach and touch test administered by OHS. After Mr. McMurray

disclosed that his prior heel/foot injury, Defendant's contractor refused to conduct

the remainder of the physical examination without reviewing the medical records

refused to allow Mr.McMurray to complete the remainder of the required physical

rescinding his offer of employment. Defendant made its decision not to hire Mr.

McMurray on the basis of his record of disability. At no time did Defendant or its

contractor assess Mr. McMurray's current ability to perform the job of Production

On September 5, 2014, Defendant sent Mr. McMurray a letter

After receiving Mr. McMurray's 2004-2006 Medical Records, OHS

contingent upon successful completion of a pre-employment physical.

July 16, 2014.

16.

17.

18.

from his prior injury.

19.

examination.

Worker.

20.

- 22
- 23
- 24 25

- 21. In addition, Defendant regarded Mr. McMurray as disabled in that it denied him employment because of a perceived disability that was not transitory or minor.
- 22. The effect of the practices complained of in paragraphs 13-21 above has been to deprive Mr. McMurray of equal employment opportunities and otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee.
- 23. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraphs 13-21 above were and are intentional.
- 24. The unlawful employment practices complained of in paragraphs 13-21 above were done with malice or with reckless indifference to the federally protected rights of Mr. McMurray.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, the Commission respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Grant a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, its officers, agents, successors, assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with it, from unlawfully failing to provide equal employment opportunities to applicants for employment and employees with disabilities and to accommodate applicants' and employees' disabilities, and any other employment practice which discriminates on the basis of disability.

EEOC v. KAISER ALUMINUM - COMPLAINT Page 7 of 10

- B. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which provide equal employment opportunities for qualified individuals with disabilities, and which eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices.
- C. Order Defendant to make whole Mr. McMurray by providing appropriate back pay with interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices.
- D. Order Defendant to make whole Mr. McMurray by providing compensation for past and future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described in paragraphs 13-21 above, including past and future out-of-pocket losses, in amounts to be determined at trial.
- E. Order Defendant to make whole Mr. McMurray by providing compensation for past and future non-pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful practices complained of in paragraphs 13-21 above, including emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, loss of enjoyment of life, and humiliation, in amounts to be determined at trial.

EEOC v. KAISER ALUMINUM - COMPLAINT Page 9 of 10

24

25

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by its complaint.

DATED this 30th day of September, 2016.

ROBERTA STEELE	P. DAVID LOPEZ
Regional Attorney	General Counsel

JOHN F. STANLEY	JAMES L. LEE
Supervisory Trial Attorney	Deputy General Counsel

TERI HEALY	GWENDOLYN Y. REAMS
Senior Trial Attorney	Associate General Counsel

Selifor That Attorney	Associate General Counsel
BY: /s/ John F. Stanley	
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY	

COMMISSION	
909 First Avenue, Suite 400	Office of the General Couns

909 First Avenue, Suite 400	Office of the General Counsel
Seattle, WA 98104-1061	131 M Street, N.E.
Telephone (206) 220-6919	Washington, D.C. 20507
Facsimile (206) 220-6911	

Attorneys for Plaintiff EEOC

EEOC v. KAISER ALUMINUM - COMPLAINT Page $10\ \mathrm{of}\ 10$